



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.usplo.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/842,913	04/27/2001	Kazutoshi Higuchi	58799-043	8374
. 7590 11/03/2004			EXAMINER	
McDermott, Will & Emery			RAMPURIA, SHARAD K	
600 13th Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005-3096			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2683	
			DATE MAILED: 11/03/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		A				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	. 09/842,913	HIGUCHI, KAZUTOSHI				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Sharad Rampuria	2683				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPL THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailin earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	I36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from e, cause the application to become ABANDONE	nely filed s will be considered timely. the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 J	une 2004.					
	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3) Since this application is in condition for allowa	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposition of Claims						
4)  Claim(s) 2-4,12 and 13 is/are pending in the a 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 5-11 is/are wit 5)  Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)  Claim(s) 2-4,12 and 13 is/are rejected. 7)  Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	thdrawn from consideration.					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the		• •				
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the E	, , , ,	,				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documen 2. Certified copies of the priority documen 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documen application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	ts have been received. ts have been received in Applicati prity documents have been receive nu (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	on No ed in this National Stage				
Attachment(s)  1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal F 6) Other:					
S. Datent and Trademark Office						

## **DETAILED ACTION**

Applicant's election without traverse of Group II, claim(s) 2-4, 12-13 in the reply filed on 06/23/04 is acknowledged.

## Claim Objections

Applicant is advised that should claim 2 be found allowable, claim 3 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof. When two claims in an application are **duplicates** or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 12-13, & 2-4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Masuda [US 6144858] (hereinafter Masuda) in view of Chang [US 6188890] (hereinafter Chang).

12. Regarding claim 12, Masuda disclose a transmitter circuit for amplifying and modulating an output signal to be transmitted as an uplink signal from an antenna, (col.5; 35-54)

Application/Control Number: 09/842,913

Art Unit: 2683

a signal demodulator for dividing an output from said receiver circuit into communication signal and a control signal, (col.5; 35-54)

wherein said control signal contains an intensity control signal for controlling the intensity of said uplink signal, said control processor, a signal for maximizing intensity of said uplink signal included within said control signal lasts for predetermined period of time. (col.7; 17-col.8; 12)

Masuda fails to disclose the control processor generating an alarm. However, Chang teaches in an analogous art, that A portable mobile unit (303; fig.9 & abstract) comprising: a receiver circuit for receiving a downlink signal from a base station, (904; fig.9) a control processor operative for receiving said control signal, (901; fig.9, col.10; 18-31) and control processor generating an alarm. (col.10; 18-24 & 33-53) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the control processor generating an alarm in order to alert and prevent the user from disconnecting the call.

- 13. Regarding claim 13, Masuda disclose A portable mobile unit according to claim 12, wherein said control processor generates an alarm when the number of base stations said portable mobile unit can communicate with properly is one. (col.5; 64-col.6; 10)
- 2. Regarding claims 2-3, Masuda disclose a signal modulator for performing code modulation of said input audio signal, (col.6; 23-34) wherein said downlink signal contains an intensity control signal for controlling intensity of said uplink signal, said control processor, a signal for maximizing intensity of said uplink signal included within said intensity control signal lasts for predetermined period of time or more, while said downlink signal is normally received at said

Application/Control Number: 09/842,913

Art Unit: 2683

receiver circuits (col.7; 17-col.8; 12) and said control processor is supplied with said control signal from said signal demodulator and said transmitter circuit amplifies and modulates an output from said signal modulator and sends out a resultant signal as an uplink from said antenna. (col.5; 35-54)

Masuda fails to disclose the control processor generating an alarm. However, Chang teaches in an analogous art, that A portable mobile unit (303; fig.9 & abstract) according to claim 12, further comprising: a receiver circuit for receiving a downlink signal from a base station, (904; fig.9) a microphone for converting voice into an input audio signal (906; fig.9), a control processor operative for receiving said control signal, (901; fig.9, col.10; 18-31) and control processor generating an alarm. (col.10; 18-24 & 33-53) Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the control processor generating an alarm in order to alert and prevent the user from disconnecting the call.

4. Regarding claim 4, Masuda disclose wherein said control processor generates an alarm when the number of communicable base stations is one; (col.5; 64-col.6; 10) and said control processor is supplied with said control signal from said signal demodulator: and said transmitter circuit amplifies and modulates an output from said signal modulator and sends out a resultant signal as an uplink from said antenna. (col.5; 35-54)

Masuda fails to disclose the control processor generating an alarm. However, Chang teaches in an analogous art, that A portable mobile unit (303; fig.9 & abstract) according to claim 12, further comprising: a receiver circuit for receiving a downlink signal from a base station, (904; fig.9) a microphone for converting voice into an input audio signal (906; fig.9), a control

Page 5

Application/Control Number: 09/842,913

Art Unit: 2683

processor operative for receiving said control signal, (901; fig.9, col.10; 18-31) and control

processor generating an alarm. (col.10; 18-24 & 33-53) Therefore, it would have been obvious to

one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include the control processor generating

an alarm in order to alert and prevent the user from disconnecting the call.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Sharad Rampuria whose telephone number is 703-308-4736.

The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri. (9:00-6:30).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 703-308-5318. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-872-9314 for regular

communications and 703-872-9314 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-4700.

Sharad Rampuria October 20, 2004

> WILLIAM TROST SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600